

### REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 31, 2003 in which the Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing certain features. Corrected drawings are submitted herewith. The amendments do not add new matter.

The specification has been amended in order to set forth the features referred to in the claims and to recite reference numbers for the features as shown in the drawings. In this connection, a Substitute Specification is attached hereto in which paragraphs 0051 and 0053 were amended. The Substitute Specification has been reformatted so that the paragraphs are individually numbered. In addition, an Annotated Specification, showing the amendments to the specification is attached.

Support for the amendments to the drawings may generally be found in the claim language as filed. With respect to the amendment to the specification reciting at least one uninsulated strand, the specification at page 15 line 23 states that one or a few strands may be uninsulated.

The claim objections have been obviated by the amendments to claims 62 and 63.

The Examiner rejected the claims as allegedly failing to comply with the description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph. While Applicants believe that the claim language is fully supported, in order to move prosecution forward, the claims have been amended to delete specific reference to 36 kV. Instead, the claim refers generally to high voltage, which is a term well understood by those having skill in the art of rotating machines.

Certain claims were rejected over art of record including Laffoon '716; Elton '565; Elton '077; Elton '116; Shildneck '139; GB '827; and Parsons, IEEE publication Sept. 1929.

Certain claims were considered allowable if they were to be rewritten in independent form and if the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 were overcome.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the opportunity to discuss the claims during a telephone conference conducted in early October 2003 and during a follow up conference on October 28, 2003. In the earlier conference Applicants' Representative suggested a number of claim modifications which are believed to obviate the technical objections. In particular, Applicants deleted reference to the specific high voltage set forth in the claims. Applicants also revised the independent claims to include the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. In particular claim 32 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 39, but modified to recite at least one uninsulated strand. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments would place the claim in allowable condition. As to the remaining claims, claim 49 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 54; and claim 55 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 56. The remaining independent claims have been rewritten to include the subject matter of claim 39, namely at least one uninsulated strand in contact with the inner layer. While not discussed specifically with the Examiner, it is believed that in view of the Examiner's assent to the allowance of claim 39, these claims are likewise allowable.

The claims as amended are believed to be allowable over the art of record, particularly the art applied by the Examiner. Also, a reference cited in other related applications, namely Takaoka, while not specifically applied by the Examiner was discussed during the telephone conferences. The Examiner indicated that the Applicants' arguments regarding Takaoka were persuasive. In particular, Takaoka does not deal with eddy currents but employs selectively insulated strands of conductor to avoid the so called skin effect in high voltage transmission lines.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider his rejection and allow the claims.

Respectfully submitted,  
DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC  
THIRD FLOOR WEST  
1300 I Street, N. W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 906-8626